

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 3 and 5 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention and to correct a typographical error in claim 5; no new subject matter has been added. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10-16 and 18-25 remain pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 10-12, 16, 19, 21, 23 and 24 as being indefinite, asserting certain limitations in independent claims 1, 3 and 5 are not clear, and that the other claims are rejected as being dependent upon one of those claims. The Applicant does not believe claims 1, 3 and 5 were “not clear,” but has entered amendments to those claims to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner’s consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

3.) Errors in Office Action

The Examiner’s stated reasons for the substantive claim rejections contain obvious errors. For example, the Examiner rejected claim 12 as being obvious over Beach (US 6,067,297) in view of Larsson, *et al.* (US 6,463,307) and Chen, *et al.* (US 5,502,724), and further in view of van Bokhorst, *et al.* (US 6,192,230). Claim 12, however, is dependent from claim 3, which the Examiner rejected as being obvious over Beach in view of Larsson and Stewart, *et al.* (US 6,732,176). Similarly, the Examiner rejected claim 22 as being obvious over Beach in view of Larsson and Stewart and further in view of van Bokhorst. Claim 22, however, is dependent from claim 8, which the Examiner rejected as being obvious over Beach in view of Larsson and Chen. Thus, the Examiner’s stated reasons for certain claim rejections are inconsistent. The Applicants have, hereinafter, best attempted to reconcile the errors in the Examiner’s

rejections. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner correct such errors in any subsequent Office Actions.

In addition, the Examiner's stated reasons for claim rejections appear to be in obvious conflict with the holdings of the BPAI in reversing the Examiner's prior claim rejections. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner carefully review the BPAI's Decision on Appeal before making any further claim rejections.

4.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 7, 10, 11, 13-16, 18 and 23 as being unpatentable over Beach in view of Larsson and Stewart; claims 5, 8, 19-21, 24 and 25 as being unpatentable over Beach in view of Larsson and Chen; claim 12 as being unpatentable over Beach in view of Larsson and Chen and further in view of van Bokhorst; claim 22 as being unpatentable over Beach in view of Larsson and Stewart and further in view of van Bokhorst. The Applicant traverses the rejections.

Claims 1, 3, 7, 10, 11, 13-16, 18 and 23

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 7, 10, 11, 13-16, 18 and 23 as being unpatentable over Beach in view of Larsson and Stewart. As noted by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI), in overturning the Examiner's prior rejections based on the teachings of Beach and Larsson:

After reviewing the disclosures of Beach and Larsson in light of the arguments of record, we are in general agreement with Appellants' position as stated in the Brief. With respect to Beach, to whatever extent the Examiner may be correct in the finding that Beach discloses a mobile terminal, a wireless network card, and an access point, the Examiner has correctly recognized that **Beach has no disclosure of any requests by the mobile terminal for a change in power state** (appealed claim 1), nor any interaction of the mobile terminal with a network interface card to force a less active power state due to inactivity (appealed claim 13).

We also find no disclosure in Larsson that would overcome the deficiencies of Beach in disclosing the specific claimed interaction among the mobile terminal, the wireless network card, and the access point. While Larsson arguably provides a teaching of a mobile terminal communicating with a base station, *i.e.*, an access point, to request a

transition to a less active power state, there is no disclosure of any kind of interaction with a wireless network interface card. Given this deficiency in the disclosure of Larsson, we fail to see how and in what manner Larsson might be combined with Beach to arrive at Appellants' invention as claimed. In view of the above discussion, we are of the opinion that, since the Larsson reference does not overcome the deficiencies of Beach discussed above, the references, even if combined, do not support the obviousness rejection. We, therefore, do not sustain the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claims 1 and 13, nor of claims 7, 11, and 14-16 dependent thereon. (emphasis added)

Despite the BPAI's reversal of the Examiner's prior reasons for claim rejections in view of Beach and Larsson, the Examiner has repeated **the same exact arguments** in the present Office Action. It appears that the Examiner merely "cut-and-pasted" his prior arguments into the present Office Action; this can, in particular, be noted on page 4, wherein the last paragraph states that claim 1 is obvious in view of Beach and Larsson – the very rejection **reversed** by the BPAI. The Examiner does, however, then state that Beach in view of Larsson "fails to explicitly recite the mobile terminal requests a NIC to communicate with the access point." To overcome this deficiency of Beach and Larsson, the Examiner then looks to the teachings of Stewart, stating that Stewart "teaches a communication network . . . that includes portable computing devices . . . comprising a NIC . . . that is used for communicating with an access point." The Examiner, however, has not pointed to any disclosure in Stewart that, in combination with the disclosures of Beach and Larsson, would teach the "specific **claimed interaction among the mobile terminal, the wireless network card, and the access point**" (emphasis added) as noted by the BPAI with respect to the deficiencies in the teachings of Beach and Larsson. The Applicants have reviewed the teachings of Stewart, and note that its teachings do not relate to methods for power savings in a mobile terminal, much less to a method that involves the interactions between a mobile terminal, a wireless network card and an access point as recited in claim 1. Therefore, just as the BPAI noted with respect to the deficiencies in the teachings of Beach and Larsson, the teachings of Beach, Larsson and Stewart, **even if combined, do not support the obviousness rejection.**

For similar reasons, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of independent claims 3, 13 and 18 over Beach in view of Larsson and Stewart. Furthermore, whereas claims 7, 11 and 16 are dependent from claim 1, claims 10, 12 and 23 are dependent from claim 3, and claims 14 and 15 are dependent from claim 13, and include the limitations of their respective base claims, those claims are also not obvious over Beach in view of Larsson and Stewart.

Claims 5, 8, 19-21, 24 and 25

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 8, 19-21, 24 and 25 as being unpatentable over Beach in view of Larsson and Chen. As noted by the BPAI, in overturning the Examiner's prior rejections based on the teachings of Beach and van Bokhorst in further view of Chen:

Lastly, we also do not sustain the Examiner's obviousness rejection of claims 5, 8, 19-22, 24, and 25 in which the Chen reference is added to the combination of Beach and van Bokhorst to address the claimed feature of a mobile terminal requesting to be disassociated or de-authenticated from an access point (independent claim 5) or from another mobile terminal (independent claim 8). While we agree with the Examiner (Answer 8-9) that Chen provides a disclosure of a mobile terminal requesting that it be disconnected from another mobile terminal, **such a teaching does not overcome the deficiencies of Beach and van Bokhorst.** As discussed previously, **there is no disclosure in Beach or van Bokhorst of a mobile terminal making a request for a transition from a active state to a less active state, a teaching which is also missing from Chen.** (emphasis added)

Despite the BPAI's reversal of the Examiner's prior reasons for claim rejections in view of Beach, van Bokhorst and Chen, the Examiner has repeated **essentially the same exact arguments** in the present Office Action based on the teachings of Beach, Larsson and Chen. In the present Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Chen "teaches a method for disconnection in a mobile terminal where the mobile terminal can request to be disconnected from another mobile terminal in an ad hoc network." As noted, however, the BPAI expressly ruled that "there is no disclosure in Beach or van Bokhorst of a mobile terminal making a request for a transition from a active state to a less active state, a teaching which is also missing from Chen." As noted *supra* with

respect to the BPAI's statements regarding the teachings of Larsson, Larsson also fails to overcome the deficiencies of Beach. Therefore, the Examiner's new reasons for rejection of claim 5 not only contradict the ruling of the BPAI, but also fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. As supported by the ruling of the BPAI, claim 8 is also not obvious over Beach in view of Larsson and Chen. Furthermore, whereas claims 19, 21 and 24 are dependent from claim 5, and claims 20, 22 and 25 are dependent from claim 8, and include the limitations of their respective base claims, those claims are also not obvious over Beach in view of Larsson and Chen.

Claims 12 and 22

As noted *supra*, the Examiner's stated reasons for rejection of claims 12 and 22 are inconsistent with his stated reasons for rejection of claims 3 and 8, from which they depend, respectively. In any event, whereas claims 3 and 8 have been shown to be patentable over the references of record, claims 12 and 22 are likewise patentable.


* * *

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10-16 and 18-25.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,


Roger S. Burleigh
Registration No. 40,542

Date: March 26, 2008

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 583-5799
roger.burleigh@ericsson.com